AN

# ANSWER

TO

## AN ADDRESS

*TO THE PEOPLE OF GREAT BRITAIN,*

BY THE BISHOP OF LANDAFF;

IN

## ANOTHER ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE,

By BENJAMIN KINGSBURY,

FORMERLY A DISSENTING MINISTER AWARWICK.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED AT NO. 85, PICCADILLY, OPPOSITE THE GREEN PARK; AT NO. 3, MITRE-COURT, FLEET-STREET; AND BY R. H. WESTLEY, NO. 201, STRAND.

1798.

[PRICE ONE SHILLING.]

407

44
3 25
1859

# AN ANSWER

TO

## AN ADDRESS, &c.

My Fellow Countrymen,

THE ſentiments which are advanced in a pamphlet addreſſed to you, and lately publiſhed, by the Biſhop of Landaff, appear to me ſo perfectly inconſiſtent with juſt reaſoning, with true patriotiſm, and with that beſt ornament of the human character, a candid and liberal mind, as to juſtify me in offering to your peruſal a ſeries of reflections of a nature ſomewhat different, and, I truſt, leſs at variance with the dictates of enlightened reaſon. In doing this, I ſhall follow this miracle of penetration, this deep financier, this ſympa-

thiſing friend of ſuffering humanity, and, in a word, this chriſtian biſhop, through the whole train of his reaſonings, and preſent you with a ſort of commentary on his opinions and his argument. If, in executing this taſk, I ſeem not impreſſed by it's difficulty, let it be ſuppoſed that my ſentiments of the performance are not altered by the ſounding titles of it's author; and, if my ſtepping forwards to the combat be underſtood as a declaration that I am not ſenſible of diſparity, let it not therefore be regarded as a proof of my preſumption.

The addreſs to which I refer begins with a declaration of the independence and impartiality of it's author. Far be it from me to attempt to unveil the ſecret motives of any man, or to affix to his profeſſions the charge of inſincerity. But I have lived long enough in the world, and have ſeen enough of human nature under a corrupt government, to have learned the folly of truſting implicitly to the language of ſelf-

encomium or diſintereſtedneſs. I have learned, too, (and it is a degree of knowledge very eaſily acquired) that, in ſuſpicious circumſtances, this ſort of language ſhould be received with peculiar diſtruſt; that it generates and will juſtify an additional degree of caution and ſuſpicion. And I imagine that you, my fellow-countrymen, will agree with me in the opinion that the lord biſhop of Landaff, the regius profeſſor of divinity in the univerſity of Cambridge, the archdeacon of Ely, &c. &c. would have conſulted the dictates of prudence by not advancing his claim to impartiality and independence. For my own part, if I feel ſurpriſe at all, it is that ſuch a veteran of the pen, a man ſo hacknied in the arts of writing, ſhould, in ſuch circumſtances, have uſhered in an addreſs to the public with ſuch an exordium. But time, perhaps, will ſhow the extent of his *expectations*.

Waving, however, the conſideration of the truth or propriety of this ſtatement, let

us proceed, my fellow-countrymen, to examine the financial expedient which the biſhop has propoſed to us, and the arguments by which he would reconcile us to it's adoption. In introducing this ſuggeſtion, it was neceſſary for him to notice the new ſyſtem of finance, of doubling, trebling, and quadrupling the aſſeſſed taxes, to which the preſent year, pregnant, in all probability, with great events, has already given birth; and of this ſyſtem of finance, which the loud voice of the nation reprobated, as big with diſtreſs and ruin, he has thought proper to expreſs his complete * approbation. Be not ſurpriſed, my fellow-

* Pardon me, reader. The inaccuracy of this learned biſhop has led me, likewiſe, into inaccuracy. He does, indeed, expreſs his complete approbation of this wiſe, this juſt, this merciful, ſyſtem of taxation; but, with a degree of inconſiſtency not unfrequent in this performance, ſoon after prefers againſt his favourite bill a charge of inequality and injuſtice. But this overſight will appear to be very natural; and will enable us to appreciate properly his claim to impartiality. It ſeems he imagines that biſhops, prieſts, and ſome others, are a little hardly dealt with by this bill. He conceives that, viewing their incomes in the light of mere annuities, worth, one with another, twelve years' purchaſe, the payment of one tenth is a ſacrifice which more than [illegible] that

countrymen. What, though by this act the little comforts which remained to you will be taken from you; what, though by this act the load of worldly misfortune which already bears ſo heavily on too many of you, may, perhaps, cruſh you to the duſt;—do you not perceive that you and your oppreſſors, or the defenders of your oppreſſors, have ſeparate intereſts? Conſider how the caſe even at preſent is. Conſider by what means their pompous palaces have been raiſed, from whom have been wrung the ſhameful ſums that are laviſhed on the idle and the worthleſs, that are offered as rewards to thoſe who bind you with the fetters of ignorance, and combine for the deſtruction of your liberties. Ah! my fellow-countrymen, while you united in deteſtation of this new ſyſtem of finance,

of the perſon whoſe income, of the ſame amount, ariſes from landed eſtates, worth, truly, thirty years' purchaſe.--In this condemnation of the bill I confeſs that I cannot join this man of diſintereſtedneſs; much as I deteſt it's principle, and ſtriking as I think it's inequalities.

while you inſtructed thoſe whom you call your repreſentatives to oppoſe this devouring monſter, the harpies who feed upon your ſpoils, who draw from you the ſupplies which they now conſider as their right, were engaged in plotting your deſtruction, were combined to defeat your wiſhes, were ſtraining every nerve to accompliſh the adoption of the tremendous ſyſtem which you deprecated, but from which they knew they ſhould derive new means of luxury and ſplendour *.

View the caſe, however, in it's moſt favourable light, ſuppoſe that none of thoſe

* The attention of the nation cannot be too often drawn to the ſtate of what is termed it's repreſentation. It has been repeatedly and confidently aſſerted that no houſe of commons, however choſen, could more completely repreſent the feelings and wiſhes of the people than a houſe of commons conſiſting, like the preſent, of men of all parties, of all profeſſions, and of all claſſes in the community. To this bold aſſertion how ſtrongly does a late event affix the ſeal of falſehood; and how completely does it evince the neceſſity of raiſing the fabrick of repreſentation on the baſis of univerſal ſuffrage! The friend of human liberty and happineſs, who believes that, by the preſent ſyſtem, the nation is deprived of it's right, cannot conſiſtently loſe ſight of this object. Every thing ſhort of this is abſurdity and injuſtice.

who have burthened you with a weight which you groan under, and which you will not be able to bear, were influenced by the proſpect of their own pecuniary intereſt; ſuppoſe, if you pleaſe, that every one of thoſe perſons who are paid ſo largely for doing nothing, or for doing what is worſe than nothing, will be obliged to diminiſh his expenditure in conſequence of a diminution of his income;—even then, I truſt, you will perceive that their intereſts and your's are not neceſſarily united; that while you, from your poverty, can part with nothing without the murmur of diſcontent or the groan of deſpair, they, from their abundance, may chearfully ſurrender a part for the ſake of preſerving the remainder. The man, who does not loſe ſight of this conſideration, will have no difficulty in reconciling the ready approbation of biſhops, placemen and penſioners with the groans and curſes of the people.

The biſhop of Landaff has informed you (and hopes you will believe it) that " with

" a family of eight children, he will feel " the preſſure of this burthen as much " as moſt men." This is one of the impoſitions which the defenders of the meaſure have attempted to practiſe upon you. In this, however, they have failed. You have penetrated the thin veil of falſehood and meanneſs with which rich individuals have ſought to miſlead you, and to hide from you the ſmallneſs of their ſacrifices. You know that the aſſeſſed taxes are not divided among the members of the community in proportion to their means of paying them, or even in proportion to their incomes. You know that the caſe is moſt ſhamefully the reverſe; and that the rich and powerful have too generally contrived to eaſe themſelves by throwing a diſproportionate burthen on thoſe who are leſs able to bear it. You are aware, too, that, were the caſe otherwiſe, were the aſſeſſed taxes, and all other taxes, to fall upon individuals in exact proportion to their incomes, the burthen would ſtill be moſt glaringly unequal; that ſome would

be periſhing for want, while others were rolling in affluence. With what colour of truth can it be ſaid that, if the ſame portion of his income (one tenth, for inſtance) be taken from the man who poſſeſſes a few hundreds, perhaps only a few ſcores, of pounds a year, as from him who is the poſſeſſor of the ſame number of thouſands; the burthen impoſed is equal? Will not the one be ſtripped of reaſonable comforts, be ſtruggling with difficulties, or overwhelmed with poverty, while the other has more than he needs, and even more than he can ſpend?—Weak, indeed, my fellow-countrymen, muſt be the underſtanding of that man who is not ſenſible of this truth; baſe, indeed, muſt be the heart which ſpurns not the idea of participating in ſuch injuſtice.

With reſpect to the biſhop of Landaff himſelf, who, with an income of many thouſands a year, imagines he ſhall feel the burthen of the late act as much as moſt men, we muſt ſuppoſe that he takes

it for granted that the bleſſings of ſuch an income are in the poſſeſſion of moſt men, or that, without ſuch an income, a family of eight children is no where to be found. In either caſe, we muſt attribute the miſtake to the glowing conceptions of the philanthropiſt, and good-naturedly wiſh that he may not awake from his deluſion. Methinks, however, one little error ſhould be corrected; the biſhop ſhould no longer deſcribe the operation of this act as in any degree burthenſome, and ſhould baniſh from his performance the language of lamentation.

But if, my fellow-countrymen, you thus conceive of a biſhop who welcomes with his praiſes a meaſure which you have ſtamped with your abhorrence, what muſt be your ſentiments when you hear of the project which he has conceived, and the depths of diſtreſs to which he would conſign you. Inſtead of being ſatisfied with extorting from you a tenth of your incomes, he recommends it to the miniſter

to call for a tenth of your whole property, in order to enable him to pay off the whole of the national debt, and regrets that this ſpirited ſcheme has not actually been executed. You ſmile, I doubt not, at the fertile imagination of this charitable biſhop, and, perhaps, feel an irreſiſtible impulſe to indulge a leſs decorous propenſity. But this matter, my friends, is grave and weighty. The biſhop informs you that he offers his plan to your conſideration, " in order that it may not be quite new, if you ſhould at length be compelled to have recourſe to ſuch an expedient." Now, as we all know that bad biſhops are admirably calculated for being the tools of bad miniſters, and as ſuch things do now and then happen, we may think it worth our while to beſtow upon his expedient a little of that conſideration which he requeſts. In one view, at leaſt, our pains will be rewarded. An examination of the arguments by which this curious ſcheme is defended, and which, I think you will admit, exceed in abſurdity

even the ſcheme itſelf, will better enable you to conceive what ſort of ſtuff a biſhop is made of.

We may divide the biſhop's defence of this meaſure into three parts. He conceives it to be neceſſary, juſt, and, in our preſent circumſtances, highly beneficial.

My fellow-countrymen, let us awake from the deluſion in which we have long ſlumbered. Let us venture to look at things as they are; diveſting ourſelves alike of prejudice and of cowardice. The criſis we are approaching demands this of us. It points out to us with irreſiſtible energy the duty which we owe to our country. According to our preſent feelings will be our fate. We ſhall either ſink deeper in the mire of corruption, or riſe to the character of freemen.

The biſhop informs us that "in our "preſent circumſtances, and with an ex- "pectation of the recurrency of war at

" ſhort periods, it is not one, two, or " three millions a year, that will preſerve " us from bankruptcy;" and that, " in the " preſent ſituation of Great Britain and " of Europe, palliatives are of no uſe, " half-meaſures cannot ſave us." In all this there is a little prieſtly cunning, a little prieſtly miſrepreſentation. It has always been the object of bad miniſters, in the attainment of which they have been faithfully ſeconded by bad prieſts, (if, indeed, the expreſſion be not tautologous) to confound their cauſe of corruption and tyranny with the intereſts of the people whom they curſe with their influence. This is ſtrikingly the caſe in the preſent inſtance. The biſhop endeavours to perſuade you that your happineſs and your ſafety are linked with the preſent ſyſtem of corruption in this country, and with the preſent miniſters who have acted ſo diſtinguiſhed a part in the developement of this ſyſtem. This is ingenious, this is prudent, this is characteriſtic. It is, indeed, a part of the ſyſtem, the *fine*

*qua non* of it's exiſtence. Deſtroy this chimera, and you are emancipated; unravel this web which a century has woven, and you are free.

My countrymen, let us ceaſe to conſider the errors and the crimes of any adminiſtration, or the corruptions of any government, as forming a part of the conſtitution of the country, and incapable of ſeparation from it. This is an error moſt fatal in it's conſequences. The nation, which continues in this deluſion, will ſooner or later produce the cataſtrophe which it moſt wiſhes to avoid. Timely and wiſe reform is prevented, and the only remedy for neglected grievances is revolution. That the ſupporters of ſuch a ſyſtem ſhould endeavour to propagate amongſt you the belief that your intereſts and their's are united, that the ſafety of the ſtate depends on the meaſures which they purſue, is natural. It is neceſſary to the continuance of their power; it is the trade by which they get their bread. But it is the intereſt of the

people to ſeparate the perſons of their public ſervants, from the loweſt to the higheſt, from that conſtitution which they adopt, and from that form of government which they are determined to ſupport. It is their intereſt to look only to principles; to pay no regard to perſons. With theſe views let us conſider the alledged neceſſity of adopting that dreadful expedient which this diſintereſted biſhop has propoſed to us; and we cannot fail to be ſenſible of the nature of that bankruptcy which he ſpeaks of, and of that neceſſity which it creates. The bankruptcy which the friends of miniſters deprecate is the bankruptcy of their places and penſions, and the neceſſity which they talk of is the neceſſity of ſupporting them in office by the corrupt arts of their creatures, and the timid apprehenſions of a deluded people. It would be abſurd to ſuppoſe that the ſafety of the ſtate can be effected by thoſe who have brought it into danger, or that a national bankruptcy can be prevented by thoſe who have doubled

our debt, deſtroyed our credit, and undermined our reſources.

But as no neceſſity exiſts for devoting a tenth of your property to pay off the national debt, to ſupport the corruptions of the ſyſtem, and to continue the emoluments of your oppreſſors, ſo neither does juſtice require that, with ſuch a ſacrifice or with any other, you ſhould attempt to liquidate a debt incurred by the folly or the guilt of your anceſtors. If, indeed, I could admit that, in any circumſtances, ſuch a claim on your juſtice could exiſt, I ſhould direct you to enquire for what purpoſes this debt was contracted, and in what purſuits the money has been expended. Ah! my fellow-men, would you liquidate a debt which has been incurred in the deſtruction of millions of human beings, or would you voluntarily pay for the fetters which enſlave you? Can it be juſt that you ſhould be called upon for a tenth or more of your property, to be employed in the liquidation of a debt which you have

had no ſhare in contracting? For do you not know, and has not proof of it been offered at the bar of the houſe of commons itſelf, that a very large majority even of thoſe of you who pay direct taxes are unrepreſented in that aſſembly which diſpoſes of your property at it's pleaſure? And, in ſuch circumſtances, ſhall a demand be made upon your juſtice for a tenth of your whole property, inſtead of a tenth of your incomes, and in addition to thoſe numerous indirect taxes which follow you from the firſt moment of your exiſtence to it's cloſe? Would the biſhop, diſintereſted as he profeſſes himſelf, would the clergy, who are the patterns of ſelf-denial and of juſtice, be ready to give up their tenths which they take from the people, not only without their conſent, but very much againſt it? You may judge of the anſwer to this queſtion from the very propoſal of the biſhop. He will continue to take his tenth of the whole produce of the earth, and will, in return, give up a tenth of all

that he poſſeſſes himſelf of.—So much for the biſhop's boaſted generoſity.

My fellow-countrymen, the biſhop is not content with aſſerting the juſtice of your being called upon to ſacrifice a tenth of your property to pay off the national debt, he undertakes to convince you that you will ſuſtain no injury by this ſacrifice. He does not, indeed, boldly aſſert this, but wiſhes to convey to you the great idea by a ſort of ſide wind, and in an indirect manner. He tells you that "no man, relatively ſpeaking, will be "either richer or poorer by this payment "being generally made, for riches and "poverty are relative terms; and that, "when all the members of a commu-"nity are proportionably reduced, the "relation between the individuals, as to "the quantum of each man's property, "remaining unaltered, the individuals "themſelves will feel no elevation or de-"preſſion in the ſcale of ſociety." To illuſtrate this very ſatisfactory idea, he

gives you the example of "a great build-
"ing, the ſymmetry of whoſe parts is
"not injured, when all the foundations
"ſink uniformly; becauſe the preſſure
"on each member remains as it was,"
&c. &c. What you will think of this curious ſpecimen of a biſhop's art, or how much it will reconcile you to his propoſal, it is not very difficult to foretell. Perhaps, you may be of opinion that your ſituation in the lower rooms of this building would be more chill and gloomy than ever; and, rather than take up your abode in the midſt of damps and darkneſs, may be inclined to viſit the upper appartments, and enjoy the proſpect of the ſurrounding country.

Neither will all this content this great politician, this ſagacious dabbler in finance. He informs you "that riches have been
"the ruin of every country, that they ba-
"niſh the ſimplicity of manners, corrupt
"the morals of a people, invite invaders,"

&c. &c.—Can you withſtand all this artillery of wiſdom?

You will, I dare ſay, imagine that the biſhop's ſtock of arguments is now exhauſted. But no ſuch thing. He is determined to contribute a little longer to your entertainment. He declares that "if we pay our debt by judicious inſtall-"ments, we ſhall neither run the riſk of "the government being broken up, as it "was in France, by the diſcontents of "the people, and an inability to go on; "nor ſhall we cripple our commerce by "the high price of labour and proviſions; "nor ſhall we be depopulated by emi-"grations to America or France; but "we ſhall preſerve the importance we "poſſeſs in Europe, and renovate the "ſtrength and vigour of the body po-"litic."

To crown the whole of the biſhop's argument, he affirms that, "were we, in "our preſent circumſtances, to diſcharge

" the national debt, all Europe would " admire our magnanimity, and France " herſelf would tremble at the idea of " ſubjugating ſo high-ſpirited a people."

*Ohe! jam ſatis eſt.—Riſum teneatis, amici?*

My fellow-countrymen, " there is an- " other point of great importance to " which" this humane and pious biſhop " wiſhes to turn your attention." Permit me to travel over the ground with you in the ſame manner as I have already done, and to direct your regards to the moſt prominent features of the landſcape. I miſtake greatly, if in this ſurvey you do not diſcover much of that illiberal cunning which characteriſes a prieſt, much of that vain boaſting for which our preſent miniſters are famous, and much of that unfortunate inconſiſtency which a bad cauſe ſo frequently produces.

The biſhop declares that " whatever " doubts he formerly entertained, or (not-

" withſtanding all he has read or heard " on the ſubject) may ſtill entertain, ei- " ther on the juſtice or the neceſſity of " commencing this war in which we are " engaged, he entertains none on the pre- " ſent neceſſity and juſtice of continuing " it." His argument is, that, " under " whatever circumſtances the war was be- " gun, it is now become juſt, becauſe the " enemy has refuſed to treat, on equita- " ble terms, for the reſtoration of peace." —I could wiſh you to remark, in paſſing, the reluctance which the biſhop ſeems to " have to expreſs his mind fully on the original character of this now juſt and ne- ceſſary war. All that you are now to imagine is, that he once entertained ſome *doubts* on this ſubject, and that it is even poſſible that he may ſtill entertain them. But he muſt excuſe my ſtating to you that there was a time when he could ex- preſs himſelf openly on this point, when he could do more than ſlightly intimate, or rather ſink into uncertainty, his ſen- timents reſpecting it. But this is only a

trifling ſpecimen of the biſhop's ingenuity. Permit me to bring forwards a much greater, and to point out to your attention a circumſtance which is generally overlooked in queſtions of this nature, but which is almoſt always deciſive. The biſhop, my countrymen, admits that we engaged in this war without being able to offer for it any plea of neceſſity or juſtice; and, as a diſtinguiſhed diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt, who was commiſſioned to bring peace on earth, and good-will to men, he can inform you, perhaps better than I can, of the heinous crime which it involves, and the diabolical ſpirit which it preſuppoſes. He can paint to you the horrors of war, and pronounce the doom which the unneceſſary ſhedding of human blood deſerves. My countrymen, if we are indeed this guilty nation, if we are yet governed by the baſe contrivers of this ſanguinary conteſt, what proof ſhall we give of our repentance, what terms of peace does it become us to offer to a nation whom we have injured! Surely,

the leaſt we can do in ſuch circumſtances, and with ſuch a ſenſe of our guilt, is to diſmiſs from our ſervice thoſe miniſters who have ſpirited us up to the vile aggreſſion. But has this, or any other, conceſſion been made by us? No; and are we then juſtified in accuſing the French of "having refuſed to treat, on "equitable terms, for the reſtoration of "peace?" Has the biſhop of Landaff, once the * bold champion of an inſulted and injured people, has he a claim to conſiſtency in the part which he now acts? —My countrymen, in what language ſhall we expreſs our deteſtation of ſuch conduct?

There are many perſons in all countries who imagine that, though war was, on the part of their government, unneceſſary and unjuſt, nay ſtudiouſly ſought after, the terms of peace which are offered at it's cloſe ſhould, nevertheleſs, be equal.

* He was the only *biſhop* who did not give his vote for a war againſt France.

This error has a very ſtriking influence in Britain. Generally as the war is reprobated, as a war unprovoked in it's origin, and unuſually calamitous in it's conſequences, there are few, comparatively, who can admit the idea of our making ſubmiſſion to a people whoſe emancipation from ſlavery we have oppoſed at the expence of the blood of myriads. There are few who can ſeparate the acknowledgement of error from the feeling of diſgrace, or admit the claim of the injured to indemnification for the paſt, and ſecurity for the future. The ſuppoſed neceſſity of avoiding ſuch humiliation creates, in ſome minds, the neceſſity of continued warfare; and circumſtances are ſought after which may give to folly and rancour the colour of expediency and juſtice. My countrymen, the criſis which we are now approaching will, doubtleſs, convince you of this fatal error. When you experience the folly of this conduct, you will be led to meditate upon it's guilt.

I cannot, however, refrain from endeavouring to expoſe to you one of thoſe inſidious arts which your greateſt, your domeſtic, enemies attempt to practice on your unwarineſs. You are told, and, among others, by this upright biſhop, that France " has threatened you with " deſtruction as a nation;" and that, " though ſhe wiſhes to ſeparate the peo- " ple from the throne, and, while ſhe in- " veighs, in harſh language, againſt the king " and the cabinet of Saint James's, ſpeaks " fairly to the people of the land, yet the " people are too wiſe to give heed to " her profeſſions of kindneſs." To reconcile you to all this, you are ſoothed with the language of flattery. " You " are all far better educated, have far " juſter notions of government, far more " ſhrewdneſs in detecting the deſigns of " thoſe who would miſlead you, than " the people of any other country." Be not offended with my plainneſs, if I remind you of what you muſt have often heard, that your national charac-

ter is ſomewhat different from, or rather the reverſe of, all this; that your eaſy nature is in nothing more apparent than in the facility with which you credit the aſſertions of your flatterers, and become a prey to their artifices. The biſhop knows your foible, and hopes to avail himſelf of your credulity. He truſts you will credit the aſſertion that the ſafety of the country and the continuance of the preſent miniſters in office are inſeparable; that, if you attempt to reform your government, and reſtore it to it's original principles, you will bury yourſelves in it's ruins. For this purpoſe, and truſting to the ſucceſs of former days, he endeavours to perſuade you that the French nation is at war with your conſtitution, and, by depriving you of that, ſeeks to humble you in the duſt. Whereas nothing is more clear than that it's ſole object is to puniſh the violaters of that conſtitution, who, by abuſing the powers entruſted to them, and artfully practiſing upon your prejudices, have

involved you in debt and poverty at home, in diſgrace and contempt abroad, in the crime of endeavouring to cruſh the riſing liberties of your fellow-creatures, and of imbruing your hands in human blood. My countrymen, is it at all wonderful that the French nation, viewing your miniſters and the corruptions of your government as the firſt cauſes and firmeſt ſupports of the infamous confederacy againſt her liberties, ſhould ſeek to deſtroy that engine of corruption, that enormous influence, which created and maintained the odious confederacy, and oppoſed even the moderate principles of her infant revolution with the ſword of inteſtine war? Deſtroy the abuſes of your conſtitution, and reſtore it to it's ſpirit and vigour, by making your repreſentation univerſal and not partial, real and not imaginary, and you may welcome the French as brethren. Continue in your preſent madneſs, let the influence of the crown or the ariſtocracy ſwallow up the po-

pular part of the conſtitution, and plunge you ſtill deeper into a conteſt originally unjuſt, unneceſſary and flagitious, and ſtamped with inſanity at preſent, and king, lords, and biſhops may be the ſacrifice.

But no, ſays this oracle of wiſdom, the French are not "an overmatch for "us." They "are not our ſuperiours in "men or money, in the valour of their "troops, or the ſkill of their command-"ers." I confeſs that I think the proper anſwer to this boaſting would be made, not in the language of argument, but, by the ſmile of contempt. The biſhop, however, ſhall have due honours paid him.

He contends, my countrymen, "that "the proportion of men capable of bear-"ing arms remaining in France, com-"pared with what Great Britain can fur-"niſh, does not exceed that of two to "one." The effects, however, of this

very accurate and conſolatory information he himſelf takes care to deſtroy by acknowledging that an unuſual proportion of the men in France *are become* ſoldiers; and that, "if we mean to face "them in a proper manner, every man "in Great Britain, who can be ſpared "from the agriculture, the manufactures, "and the commerce of the country *, "*muſt become* a ſoldier," likewiſe.—Another little error the biſhop has fallen into on this ſubject. He ſtates that, "were "there even a bridge from Calais to "Dover, France could not ſend into the "field as many men as we could oppoſe "againſt her, becauſe her own citizens" would take that opportunity of endeavouring "to regain the bleſſings they "have loſt;" whereas, in page 37 of the ſame pamphlet we are informed that, "du-"ring the monarchy, there was little free-"dom in France." I believe that, "were "there," indeed, "a bridge from Ca-

* The biſhop has forgotten to mention his brethren, the clergy. Might not they be as well ſpared as any others?

" lais to Dover," there are few beſides biſhops who would have any doubt of the reſult.

As to money, he repeats the old tale that France " has no means within her-" ſelf of providing for her armies. She " intends to ſend them into this country " either that ſhe may pay them, as ſhe " has done in Italy, by plunder, or, in the " true ſpirit of deſpair, cancel her debts, " by ſacrificing the perſons of her ſoldiers." It is ſufficient to reply to this abſurdity that France was ſaid to be in the ſame deplorable ſituation long before ſhe humbled at her feet armies far more powerful, and generals far more ſkilful, than any which we can oppoſe againſt her.

But the biſhop *does* acknowledge that " to the valour of the French troops he " has *nothing to object.*" With the ſame breath, however, he fritters away the " praiſe which is due to the gallantry " even of an enemy." " They have ſuf-

" tained with courage *many onſets ;*" but " fifty thouſand Engliſhmen would, with- " out heſitation, attack an hundred thou- " ſand Frenchmen."—This, it is true, is not ſo much as the long eſtabliſhed tale of one Engliſhman beating three Frenchmen. Unluckily, certain circumſtances have too directly contradicted this old and convenient maxim. The biſhop is, therefore, compelled unwillingly to confine our proweſs to the *onſet*.

" As to the relative ſkill of the com- " manders, it would ill become me to " give any opinion. *If I were to admit* " that the French generals are *not infe- " rior* to our own in martial ability, yet " in the local knowledge of the coun- " try, and in the correctneſs and fidelity " of the information they will receive, " ours will certainly have the advantage." —I ſatisfy myſelf with printing in italics a few expreſſive words of this paltry ſample of the biſhop's candour ; and with begging you to contraſt in your ima-

ginations the diſtinguiſhed leader of the Dunkirk runaways with the great and glorious BUONAPARTE.

" But *if* the French are not our ſu-
" periors, either in men or money, in
" the valour of their ſoldiers, or the ſkill
" of their commanders, what have we to
" apprehend, ſhould we be forced to
" fight them on our own ground. Should
" the enemy land their forces, I ſee no
" reaſon why we ſhould deſpair of our
" country, if we are only faithful to our-
" ſelves, if, forgetting all party animoſity,
" we ſtand collected as one man againſt
" them."—What right have the preſent miniſters to call for unanimity, when the direct tendency of their meaſures * is to ſtir up the bitterneſs of party hatred?

* A curious ſpecimen of their ſpite and folly has juſt been exhibited. The duke of Norfolk, guilty of the high crime and miſdemeanour of celebrating Mr. Fox's birth-day, and of giving as a toaſt " Our ſovereign," or our only ſovereign, " the ma-
" jeſty of the people,"---a toaſt of many years ſtanding, and the offspring of good ſenſe and juſt views of the conſtitution, has

" There may be ſome real republicans " in the kingdom. Their number, I " am convinced, is extremely ſmall."— If the biſhop knew any thing about the matter, he would know that the number of theſe perſons is not ſmall; that it increaſes rapidly; and will continue to increaſe at leaſt as long as the preſent miniſters remain in office, or ſuch meaſures as the preſent are adopted.

" France threatens us with the payment " of what ſhe calls a debt of indemni- " fication; and, under this pretence, will " demand millions upon tens of millions; " ſhe will beggar every man of property;

been diſmiſſed from his employments as lord lieutenant of the county of York, and colonel of the Weſt York militia. It is confidently aſſerted that all the ſuperior officers of the regiment, indignant at the treatment of their reſpected colonel, have given in their reſignations. And it is reported that all the lord lieutenants and officers of militia in the kingdom, who are not under the influence of our preſent miniſters, have determined to teſtify their ſenſe of this tranſaction in the ſame manner.---My countrymen, this is the way in which your miniſters endeavour to procure unanimity, and to check the progreſs of republicaniſm.

" and reduce the lower orders to the " condition of her own peaſants and ar- " tificers——black bread, onions, and " water."——My countrymen, your mi- niſters have already taken care to guard you from theſe evils. Inſtead of demand- ing from you millions and tens of millions, they have taken charge of hundreds of millions; and, to own the truth, have done much towards reducing you to " black bread, onions, and water."

In anſwer to the charge that we are " the tyrants of the ocean, and that we " aſſume a dominion over the ſeas which " the law of nations does not allow," the biſhop ſays he " *ſincerely hopes* the " accuſation is not true; becauſe no ty- " ranny either can be, or ought to be, " laſting;" and aſſures you that he is an " utter enemy to all dominion founded in " mere power, unaccompanied with a juſt " regard to the rights of individuals or " nations."—To this language I imagine

no key is neceſſary. It is a poor attempt to gloſs over a bad cauſe.

My countrymen, I feel but little inclination to follow the biſhop through all the minutiæ of his abſurdities. It is, indeed, a diſguſting taſk. But on one ſubject I would not be ſilent; on the fate of unhappy Ireland. In this, however, I ſhall do little more than quote the biſhop's own language. He has the happy art of giving queſtions and anſwers with the ſame breath, of expreſſing his dogmas with ſo much perſpicuity as to render argument ſuperfluous.

" If Ireland ſo far liſtens to her reſent-
" ment (*however it has originated*) againſt
" this kingdom; if ſhe ſo far indulges her
" *chagrin* againſt her own legiſlature, as
" to ſeek for redreſs by throwing herſelf
" into the arms of France, ſhe *will be un-*
" *done, her freedom will be loſt, ſhe will be*
" *ſunk in the ſcale of nations.* Inſtead of
" *flouriſhing* under the protection of *a ſiſ-*

" *ter that loves her*, ſhe will be fettered as " a ſlave to the feet of the greateſt deſpot " that ever afflicted human kind—to the " feet of French democracy."—What muſt be the nature of that cauſe which will not admit of a more plauſible defence than this? What ſhould be the anſwer to that claim to unanimity which reſts on a baſis ſo weak and tottering as this? My countrymen, in every event IRELAND WILL BE FREE.

There is one part of the biſhop's pamphlet to which I ſubſcribe my hearty aſſent. I have buſied myſelf for ſome time in endeavouring to trace a connection between it and ſome other part of his production; but to this taſk I confeſs that my abilities are unequal. I quote it that you, my countrymen, may determine whether this ſcintillation of truth and candour has appeared in it's appropriate ſituation, whether this gleam of liberality has found a paſſage in it's proper place.

" The channels of commerce, were they " open alike to the enterpriſe of all na- " tions, are ſo numerous and copious in " the four quarters of the globe, that the " induſtry of all the manufacturers in Eu- " rope might be fully employed in ſup- " plying them. America is doubling her " numbers, and will for many years want " ſupplies from the manufactories of Great " Britain. Africa will in time civilize her " millions, and afford for centuries a mar- " ket for the commodities of all Europe. " What folly is it then in civilized, what " wickedneſs in chriſtian ſtates, to be en- " gaged every ten or twenty years in de- " ſtroying millions of men, for the pro- " tection or the acquiſition of arbitrary " monopolies."—To this queſtion, put with ſo much propriety and force, I pro- feſs myſelf at a loſs to conceive what ſa- tisfactory anſwer, what plea of extenua- tion, can be offered by the monopolizing companies and ſanguinary miniſters of Britain.

My countrymen, "there ſtill remains another ſubject which" the biſhop of Landaff is "moſt anxious to recommend to "your ſerious conſideration—the at-"tempts of bad men to rob you of your "religion."—This is the third grand argument which the biſhop adduces to reconcile you to your preſent miniſters and to their preſent meaſures. It would have been ſtrange, indeed, if a biſhop of the church of England had omitted it.

The cry that religion is in danger has been often reſorted to by perſons who derive from the profeſſion of religion ſuch enormous emoluments as fully prove that they know little of the ſpirit or the practice of it. This outcry is raiſed by theſe perſons when they conceive that the continuance of their diſhonourable gains is in danger, and when they wiſh to impede the progreſs of public knowledge. The general ferment which this outcry occaſions is interpreted by prieſts as a clear proof that their cauſe reſts on too firm a

baſis to fear any attack, and they wrap themſelves up in the conſolations of ſuppoſed victory, without being ſenſible, poor ſouls! of the increaſed danger into which the ſtructure of their pride and rapacity is brought by every one of theſe tumults. For, lo! the current of public opinion becomes more powerful in conſequence of the reſiſtance it has met with, and the danger of the edifice is more imminent. Another attack is made on it, and another outcry is raiſed; till, at laſt, the war-whoop of religion is ſounded in vain, and the prieſtly fabrick crumbles into duſt.—When the people begin to feel but little intereſt in theſe matters, the downfal of the ſyſtem is at hand; and it would be well for the ſupporters of religious eſtabliſhments if they would attend to the leſſon which the preſent day ſo emphatically teaches, and aſſume, if not the character, at leaſt, the language of moderation.

My countrymen, it is not at all ſurpriſ-

ing that a biſhop of the church of England, who gains ſo much by what he calls his religion, ſhould be very angry when the people begin to think that they might apply their money to a better purpoſe; and you muſt make ſome allowance for that natural warmth of feeling with which, in ſuch circumſtances, he will expreſs his reſentment. His indignation at the atrocious attempt to take from him ſo lucrative a profeſſion will carry him ſomewhat beyond the bounds of truth and prudence, and lead him to deſcribe as realities the viſions of his teeming fancy. The biſhop of Landaff, angry (as well he may be) that the chriſtian religion, or the doctrine of the church of England, (for, in a biſhop's opinion, theſe words mean the ſame thing) has been attacked by "certain men who eſteemed themſelves philoſophers," chuſes to repreſent this attack, carried on, no doubt, in different countries but by the ſame means, as the effect of a regular ſyſtem, a ſort of general combination; and beſtows upon theſe *profane* men a little of

that pious abuſe which holy mother church has ſo often poured out upon the ungodly. He accuſes them of endeavouring to "brutalize mankind," by depriving them of "all reverence for a ſupreme being, of all "fear of perjury, of all apprehenſion of "futurity, of all check from conſcience;" and aſſerts that they thus endeavour "to "prepare proper actors in a ſcene of ra-"pine, devaſtation, and blood-ſhed." Though not an enemy to chriſtianity myſelf, I am of opinion that unbelievers have done leſs to "brutalize mankind and to "prepare proper actors in ſcenes of rapine, "devaſtation and bloodſhed," than thoſe "orthodox believers" who, like the biſhop, are fond of keeping things as they are, and who, inſtead of promoting the melioration of the human ſpecies, are "engaged every "ten or twenty years in deſtroying mil-"lions of men," "for the gratification of "their ambition, their avarice, or their "revenge." My countrymen, "it is "againſt the machinations of *theſe* men, "ſecret or open, ſolitary or aſſociatd, that "I wiſh to warn you."

The biſhop admits that "no civil or ecclesiaſtical conſtitution can be ſo formed "by human wiſdom as to admit of no improvement upon an increaſe of wiſdom; "as to require no alteration when an alteration in the knowledge, manners, opinions, and circumſtances of a people has "taken place." But he is of opinion that "men ought to have the modeſty to know "for what they are fitted, aud the diſcretion to confine their exertions to ſubjects of which they have a competent knowledge"; in ſhort, that none but a *divine* (as the precious phraſe is) ſhould meddle with religion, and none but a ſtateſman affect to underſtand politics. "Mechanics and manufacturers" are "the "frothy frequenters of ale-houſes, the "diſcontented declaimers againſt our eſtabliſhment, the miſerable dregs of the "nation who ſeek for diſtinction in public "confuſion."—Theſe convenient doctrines will, I doubt not, excite in your minds their appropriate ſenſations; and you will be at no loſs to underſtand the nature of

that " decent freedom" with which the biſhop would permit " the dogmas of his " holy religion to be diſcuſſed."

The biſhop triumphantly aſks whether, " admitting that there is a natural equality " amongſt mankind, it follows that there " may not be, or that there ought not to " be, an inſtituted inequality." In anſwer to this queſtion, I will tell the biſhop that the term " inſtituted inequality" contains nothing but nonſenſe; that, with reſpect to riches, inequality takes place in a ſtate of nature as well as in a ſtate of ſociety; and that, with reſpect to rank, no real inequality can take place by titles being beſtowed on thoſe who are deſtitute of merit, excepting that ſort of inequality which is cauſed by the ſinking of the ſilly beings who are fond of ſuch trifles, in rational eſtimation, below the general level of ſociety.

With reſpect to the attacks that have been lately made upon the chriſtian reli-

gion, or ſuppoſed parts of it, I beg leave to expreſs my conviction that the moſt unbounded inquiry, in whatever form it may appear, will render no diſſervice to real chriſtianity; and that the number of unbelievers, great as it undoubtedly is, ſhould be attributed, not to the weakneſs of the chriſtian cauſe, but to the ill-directed and inexcuſable zeal of its ſupporters, to biſhops and to prieſts. But, if the foundations of chriſtianity ſhould, eventually, be found incapable of reſiſting the attacks of free inquiry and unfettered reaſon, I am perſuaded that no man of real liberality, NO LOVER OF TRUTH, will join in the ſenſeleſs clamour of religious eſtabliſhments, or heſitate to welcome the well-tried maxim,

*Magna eſt Veritas, et prevalebit.*